

The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Vol. VI. No. 25.

Workers' Library Publishers,
35 East 125th St., New York.

TEN CENTS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Socialist Construction in the U.S.S.R. <i>By H. Nagler</i>	997
Capitalist Rationalisation and the Standard of Living of the Anglo-American Proletariat. <i>By N. Nasonov</i>	1001
E.C.C.I. Activities	1005
The Fight for the New Line <i>By J. F.</i>	1012
The Development of the Revolutionary Class Struggle in Germany	1018

Socialist Construction in the U.S.S.R.

By H. Nagler

THE first year of the five-year plan, the great plan of socialist onslaught on the urban and rural bourgeoisie and of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., is ending. On the threshold of the second year of the five-year plan, the U.S.S.R. not only strikes the balance of the past year, but maps out the principal stages of development of socialist economy for the coming year.

The figures on the development of national economy for 1928-29 are of extraordinary importance in their indication of further tendencies of Soviet national economy. The general line of the whole economic policy—the course of speedy socialisation of national economy of the U.S.S.R.—has this year progressed more than anticipated in the plan, and indicates a possibility of further development in that direction. What stands out in this is the industrialisation of the country; the revolutionary reconstruction of agriculture on socialist foundations.

The sceptics argue to this day that the Soviet Union has undertaken Utopian and obviously impossible tasks. The experience of the first of the five years absolutely refutes this opinion. What is essential is not only the fact that the plan is being carried out in general, but chiefly the lines along which the plan is being surpassed. The first year proves that notwithstanding the great strain, notwithstanding its difficulties, the proletarian state was able to carry out the programme of socialist construction in the most decisive spheres of industry and agriculture.

The plan of development of private industry and agriculture has not been fully carried out. But the plan of socialised industrial and agricultural development has been carried out and excelled. This fact proves that the creative forces and the potentiality of the proletariat in the sphere of socialisation of economy have obviously been under-estimated in the plan. The experience of the first year has shown us that we have a wealth of unused reserves such

as, for instance, Socialist contests and the uninterrupted working week which are of decisive importance in hastening the rate of industrialisation and socialisation of Soviet economy as compared with the rates of the five-year plan.

The results of the first year, characterising the general economic growth of the Union in 1928-29, show that the plan is being fully carried out, and judging from the viewpoint of the market, we can say that the plan has been excelled by an enormous sum, almost two billion roubles, or 8 per cent. The plan has been excelled both in industry and transport. The greatest gains are in the large scale socialised industry, the main lever of socialist construction. Large-scale socialised industry has increased about 24 per cent. instead of the 21.4 per cent. mapped out in the plan. At the same time it should be emphasised that the output of private industry has actually diminished 8.9 per cent. as compared with the plan. By this the proletarian dictatorship proved stronger than was expected in the plan in the most important and decisive branch of national economy and in the socialised sector as a whole.

The picture is similar in the sphere of agriculture. The achievements here are of tremendous revolutionary significance, especially if we take into account the backwardness of agriculture. The fact that in the socialised branch of agriculture we have actually gone beyond the limits of the plan is of particularly great importance. It suffices to mention only some of the indices of the development of the socialised branch of agriculture to realise the great historical significance of the rapid socialist reconstruction of agriculture. The cultivated areas of government farms increased by 27½ per cent. in the spring of 1929 instead of 7.1 per cent. called for in the plan. The areas of collective farms increased by 207.1 per cent. instead of 94.1 per cent. The grain produced in the socialised branch of agriculture increased in one year from 2.6 per cent. to 5.6 per cent. of the gross produce, instead of the 4.9 per cent. mentioned in the plan, etc.

There are great hardships to contend with in the sphere of agricultural development. The greatest failures were predicted in this sphere not only by enemies, but also by "friends." The past year has been a year of strenuous

struggle for socialist transformation of agriculture. The immeasurable backwardness of agriculture, the failure of the winter crop of 1927, and many other causes brought about a stringency on the bread market in 1928. It was therefore decided that the cultivated areas of 1929 should increase 7 per cent. with an improved yield of 3 per cent., and an increase in the grain produce of 10 per cent., as compared with the preceding year. That decision called forth much ridicule on the part of our "friends," and enemies. How is it possible, they said, to decide such things for 25 million households? What will stimulate the peasant to cultivate more land?

The results of the year show that we have an increase of 5.5 per cent. of land under grain, as compared with last year. This is so, notwithstanding the failure of the winter crop (about 7 million hectares, which is more than 5 million hectares above the usual area). Apart from the failure of the winter crop we had a drought on the Volga which somewhat reduced the yield per hectare. But with all these unfavourable conditions, this year's grain crop is 6 per cent. greater than last year's.

Success in the struggle for bread means success in a desperate class struggle in the rural areas, successful development of socialist economy, successful work in the economic uplifting of the poor and middle peasants, which is fiercely resisted by the rich peasants who even curtail their production. Of the 5.5 per cent. increase in the land under grain, about 3.3 per cent. falls to the socialist branch and 2.2 per cent. to the poor and middle peasants. The rich and well-to-do groups have not extended, but rather, considerably curtailed their cultivated tracts. This shows that economic power has passed out of the hands of the wealthy peasants on the most responsible and the most vulnerable front of the class struggle—the grain front.

These results of socialist construction and socialist progress on the agrarian front show that we can undertake even greater tasks for the next year, that we can still further attack the rich classes in the struggle for bread, that we can more extensively and widely develop the socialist branch of agriculture.

Considering that the relative strength of the socialist branch in the areas under grain is about 7 per cent. and in the output for the market

about 20 per cent., considering the construction of dozens of large mechanised grain factories over millions of hectares of land, considering the extent of the collective farm movement which exceeds the most optimistic expectations, considering finally the enormous ideological victory of machine and tractor stations, the proletarian State can draw the following conclusions for next year: more aggressiveness can be displayed in the struggle against the capitalist rural elements, the socialist agricultural branch can be extended, the attention to the struggle for bread must not be abated, work must be done by the socialist branch in the sphere of raw material and cattle breeding.

The control figures of the development of Soviet national economy for 1929-30 map out an increase in the output of planned industry of 33.3 per cent. as against 21.5 per cent. indicated in the five-year plan. Railway transport, according to those control figures, will increase its gross income by 23 per cent. instead of 14 per cent.; industrial construction will increase 92 per cent. instead of 52 per cent.; the turnover of trade will increase 34.6 per cent. instead of 25 per cent. In agriculture the control figures map out a general increase in the cultivated areas of 10.5 per cent. an increase in the areas of the socialist branch of 170 per cent., i.e., almost threefold. The relative strength of the socialist branch in the cultivated areas will rise from 6 to 14 per cent., reaching the figure of 36 per cent. in the grain purchases of 1929-30 and 45 per cent. in the marketable grain. The year of 1929-30 is to give the socialist branch of agriculture the relative strength which was assigned to it by the five-year plan for the end of the five years. In 1930-31 the edict of the five-year plan that the kulak be driven out of his economic positions and that his place be taken by the socialist branch will be carried out. The rapid organisation of grain factories, to the extent of 120 this year, the increasing economic importance of the old government farms, the almost trebled rate of organisation of collective farms, which already embrace over 2½ million households, all go to solve this task. The socialist branch of agriculture will embrace about 20 million hectares while the number of individual peasant farms will decrease more than a million. This is a fact of tremendous importance. Previously the number of farms

increased annually more than half-a-million as a result of the constant process of the break up of households in the U.S.S.R. In the past year the number remained stable. In the forthcoming year, we shall have an absolute diminution. As a result there will be but a slight increase in the cultivated areas of individual farmers, not more than 2 per cent.

Industry and all other branches of national economy must so build their plans, difficult though it be, as to guarantee the maintenance of these rates of socialist reconstruction of agriculture. Rapid industrialisation of the country, high rates of industrial development, especially the development of production of means of production for agriculture, are conditions absolutely necessary for the realisation of the required rates of development of the socialist branch of agriculture.

National revenue of 1929-30 will increase 6 billion roubles. The increase falls entirely to the socialised sector. The income of the private sector diminishes 750 million roubles. This diminution is due chiefly to the process of socialisation of individual production of a considerable section of the peasants, craftsmen and artisans. The growth of national income as distributed among the various social groups shows the following very characteristic picture: the peasantry will have an increase of 7.0 per cent. and the proletariat of 16.7 per cent.

Is this great programme of production and capital construction capable of realisation? The balance of building material and the balance of fuel fully harmonise with this plan. The balance of metal requires some support from abroad. From a financial point of view, the programme of construction of 1929-30 is quite safe. The budget which amounts to 10½ billion roubles appropriates for this purpose about 4,800,000,000 roubles. The rest is covered by the inner resources of the socialised sector and with the aid of internal loans.

The balance of supply and demand on the market shows a possible increase in the supply of 10.7 per cent. thus fully covering the demand.

To guarantee the carrying out of this vast programme of socialist construction there is just as vast a programme of mobilisation of the country's resources by means of drawing in the net profits of the government and co-operative enterprises, taxes, internal loans, current

accounts and deposits, shares and membership dues, social insurance and other resources coming into the hands of the State. About 17½ billion roubles are thus mobilised, exceeding the figures given for this year in the five-year plan by over 7 billion roubles. This growth in the financial plan in the course of one year shows that the socialised sector is very rapidly getting hold of the decisive positions in national economy, to the detriment of the private sector, and that the mobilisation of resources for new capital investments in the socialist sector develops with unexampled rapidity. The accumulated means are used for financing national economy, administration, defence, education, hygiene, etc. This distribution of resources mobilised by one financial plan clearly reflects the socialist character of Soviet finance. Of the 17½ billion roubles in the plan about 11 billion roubles are to be invested in national economy. This marks a tremendous increase of investments, over 50 per cent. as compared with last year. First place among these investments naturally falls to capital expenditure and to an increase in means of circulation. The second place is given to agriculture and transport. There will be a big increase in expenditure on

education and hygiene, etc., with a slight increase in the expenses of administration and defence.

From the above, it is obvious that the coming year will not only witness the fulfilment of the tasks outlined in the five-year plan, but will considerably exceed the five-year outline of economic development in rates harmonising with the determined socialist offensive on the urban and rural bourgeoisie and the courageous development of the socialist economic sector. The creative forces of the proletariat and the broad masses of urban and rural labourers revealed in the sweeping wave of socialist contests, the growing activity of the toiling masses, the introduction of the uninterrupted working week, the enforcement of better labour discipline—such are the energetic resources which enable the mapping out of high rates of development of national economy in the coming year, and of the assumed method of surmounting the difficulties which are a result of accentuated class struggle on an increased number of fronts, not only the grain front, but also the food front, the front of economic construction. The tempo decided upon guarantees further progress in the field of socialist construction.

The **ENGLISH EDITION** of the **COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL**
is published twice monthly.

Subscription Rates 8s. per annum in England, \$2 per annum in U.S.A.
post free through any bookseller.

Capitalist Rationalisation and the Standard of Living of the Anglo-American Proletariat

By N. Nasonov
(Conclusion).

THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT AND THE PAUPERISATION OF THE BRITISH PROLETARIAT.

IN the preceding article we have mentioned that the Labourites themselves admit that real wages have fallen (Snowden), or that they have remained unchanged (the General Council).

In voting for a Labour Government, the workers voted for a higher standard of living and a cessation of attacks on present standards. The lock-out in the textile industry proved most clearly that in voting for a Labour Government the workers on no account voted for industrial peace or for rationalisation.

The trade union bureaucracy in the textile workers' unions circulated a ballot paper among the workers prior to the lock-out, containing two questions which the workers had to answer: (1) whether they wanted to resist a wage cut; (2) whether they leave it to their leaders finally to settle the conflict.

We do not know the answer of the workers on the second question, but 97 per cent. answered in the affirmative on the first question. Most likely most of the textile workers also empowered their leaders to negotiate.

Therein lies the crux of the situation in Great Britain.

The workers trusting their "leaders," vote in favour of a fight, and the "leaders" lead that strike in order to keep it within the boundaries of "industrial peace."

In their struggle against the workers, the textile manufacturers used arguments partly taken from the arsenal of the Labour Party.

In its message to Lancashire, the Federation of Master Cotton Spinners' Associations, Limited, says:

"Wages to-day are mostly 90 per cent. over pre-war rates. The cost of living is 60 per cent. above pre-war levels. These figures justify the employers' belief that the proposed wage reduction can be borne without undue hardship."

These are arguments with facts supplied by

the Baldwin Government and sanctioned by the MacDonald Government.

We shall deal later with the standard of living, now we shall take up merely the nominal wage of the textile workers. Let us take the weavers, the most conservative section of textile workers of Great Britain.

During the negotiations with the employers, the reformist leaders of the weavers promised to submit in writing their arguments against a wage cut. That document was written and submitted to the employers on July 10th. In it we read:

"Our present rates of wages approximate to the increased cost of living as compared with the pre-war period. The Ministry of Labour Gazette for June, 1929, gives the following average increases since July, 1924: 'All items (in the cost of living) 60 per cent.' The majority of our members are paid under a piece price list which gave a rate of wages before the war represented by the figure 105, and which now stands at 195. If that figure is adjusted to the present working week of 48 hours, as compared with the 55½ hour working week, the rate of wage increase is 60.6 per cent. over the rate prevailing before the war. If one half-hour is allowed for cleansing time, the advance is 60.4 per cent. Consequently the present rates of wages are not out of proportion to the cost of living as compared with pre-war prices."

The official reply of the trade union bureaucracy to the employers is so worded as not to rouse the workers. For the leaders the question as to the possibility of fighting the bosses was settled long ago. That is why the tone of their reply is such as to imply that they are in favour of the *status quo*. But they themselves betray the incorrectness of their calculations.

For instance, the *Manchester Guardian*, in the words of its correspondent, states that one of the representatives of the weavers' union told the correspondent that a female weaver receives

an average of about 11s. per roll, but owing to the lack of work many of them are given only two instead of the customary three or four rolls. The result is that their actual earnings are not above 30s. to 34s. per week, which, considering the cost of living, is considerably less than pre-war. Then the bureaucrat shows his true face and betrays the plans of the Labour Government. He says that they would prefer that as many as possible should be working full time and the others should be unemployed until there was enough work for them. But this conflicts with the views of the employers, as no employer wants to lose his good workers.

In this statement the philosophy of the Labour Party, that is reliance, on the upper stratum, as against the rest of the workers, is to be discerned. The Labour Government, by the arbitration decision in the textile lock-out, sanctioned the continuation of the capitalist policy of further lowering the standard of living of the working-class. The difference being that now, under the Labour Government, the employers assume the offensive all along the front.

The capitalists with the aid of the Labour Government, are reducing the level of the British workers to that of the coolie. Purcell holds this to be inevitable. In an article entitled "A Coolie Level for Lancashire," Purcell writes. :

"Unless wages can be raised in the East and throughout the cotton world generally, they must, under capitalism, come down in Lancashire. . . If the mills are to survive in Britain, our Lancashire folk will be forced down to the coolie level."

A fine perspective for the British workers ! Whether wages rise in the East or not, depends on revolutionary struggle. But the MacDonald Government and the whole Labour Party pursue a capitalist policy against a rise in the standard of living of the colonial workers as well as of the British workers. The textile workers of Bombay who fought for a higher standard of living are being dispersed by the Labour Government, their leaders are imprisoned, and their unions demolished. In England, on the other hand, the Labour Party takes steps to approximate the level of the British workers to that of the coolie.

Purcell is right. Under capitalism the British workers must decline to the level of poverty of the coolie. Purcell and the whole Labour Party see a way out in rationalisation, but what rationalisation means we see by the American example. Capitalist rationalisation only worsens the conditions of the working-class.

The success of the Labour Party was due precisely to the reduced standard of living of the working-class. One only has to analyse the wage rates and the standard of living to see that.

What do British statistics show ?

The aggregate amount of wages is falling. The best illustration can be taken from the figures on income taxes. The aggregate weekly income of the workers subject to taxation in 1926-27 was about £196,300,000, while in 1925-26 it was £243,000,000, and in 1924-25 £343,500,000. These figures show that the number of people earning about £5 and more per week has fallen 50 per cent. This shows better than anything how shameless are those who dare say that the position of the working-class with regard to wages has improved.

The internal wage changes are most uneven.

Piecework becomes ever more widespread and is in every way being encouraged. The Balfour Commission which investigated the position of British industry, noted with satisfaction that the piecework system was developing. A characteristic feature in the changing of the wage system is the rapid development of hour pay as compared with pay per week. According to the Ministry of Labour, pay per hour shows an average increase of 90 per cent. to 100 per cent., while pay per week only 70 per cent. to 75 per cent. In British conditions this reorganisation means growing unsteadiness in work, a worsening of the workers' conditions, etc. The comparatively more rapid development of pay per hour indicates preparations for an attack on the short working day. By means of hour payment the British workers are being prepared for the ten-hour day.

Time pay has an average increase of 70 per cent. to 75 per cent. as compared with war-time, and has a diminishing tendency in the last few years.

The rise in wages of unskilled labourers in the building industry, the docks, bakers, freight carriers, etc., has also ceased. During the war

and after, the wages of these categories of workers grew comparatively more than those of the others. For instance, compared with the pre-war level, general wages in the docks and shipyards increased not more than 40 per cent. to 45 per cent. while those of the unskilled labourers in those enterprises, 100 per cent. Finally, about the agricultural labourers of whom there is approximately 700,000 in Great Britain. The British agricultural labourers are supposed to be paid in accordance with a decision of the Ministry for Agriculture of 1924. The wages of this category of workers obviously lag behind the official index. This is now admitted by the National Union of Agricultural Labourers and the rural section of the Transport and General Workers' Union.

A conference of these organisations issued a statement about growing unemployment and wage cuts. It said that the conference was shocked by the reports about wages being much lower than those fixed by the Ministry for Agriculture, and that it will take the necessary measures to persuade the Ministry to put a stop to the continuation of such a scandalous situation.

The agricultural labourers are not insured against unemployment. The promises of the Labour Party to insure the agricultural labourers have not as yet materialised.

Marx pointed out that the wages of an agricultural labourer are always kept at the minimum and that the farm hand has always one foot in the mire of pauperism.

Obviously, the minimum is declining and the mire of pauperism is coming closer to the whole British working-class.

In the aggregate amount of wages the share of the chemical workers has considerably increased in the last ten years. Compared with pre-war, wages in the chemical industry have increased 105 per cent. to 115 per cent.

The share of wages of office workers, officials, managers, etc., is increasing in the aggregate while the wages of the basic mass of workers are declining. The miners receive only 43 per cent. over the pre-war wage, shipbuilders 20 per cent. to 45 per cent., while wages in general have increased 70 per cent. to 75 per cent.

Here is how Harry Bolton, a Durham weighman describes the situation of the miners in the *Miner* ;—

"The men are working longer hours for less than they were receiving before the war. Men are breaking down under the strain ; women are suffering from nervous strain, and children are being half-starved."

"*Daily Herald*," Sept. 13, 1929.

The unevenness in the distribution of the war and post-war rise is indicated by a fall in the membership of unions in the chief industries and an increase in the unions of State employees, technicians, etc.

We spoke above only of a wage rise as compared with the pre-war level. But the cost of living has also risen 70 per cent. to 75 per cent., as compared with pre-war. There were big debates held on the question of the cost of living at the recent Trades Union Congress in Belfast. Dorothy Evans, a delegate to the Congress, moved the creation of a special commission to determine the real living minimum. We shall add that there are great divergencies of opinion among the trade union officials on the indices. For instance, according to the Trades Union Congress, the actual real wage is 99 per cent. of the real wage of 1920. According to the Labour Research Department, it is only 94 per cent. Most of the misunderstanding is caused by the indices which are distorted by the Ministry for Labour. Dorothy Evans pointed out that the index on rent shows an increase of 50 per cent. She asked the delegates at the Congress to mention at least one house where rent has not risen more than 50 per cent. Moreover, according to her, even in the houses which belong to the unions, rent has gone up much more than 50 per cent. How badly the index is put up can be seen from the fact that expenses on clothes include figures based on their duration before the war. But everybody knows that the quality of British material, beginning with wool and ending with cotton, has fallen and become considerably worse. As to rent, we have already mentioned what Dorothy Evans had to say.

The best judges as to the correctness of the index figures are not bourgeois statisticians, not "scientific investigators," but the working-class housewives. The British "labour" press does not publish such material regularly, but it occasionally finds its way into the paper. The journal of the Postal Workers' Union published two letters from workers' wives. On September

1st, the index of the cost of living of civil servants was revised. One of the letters denies that the price of potatoes, butter, and lard had fallen as is indicated in the June index.

It is a fine index if a worker's wife is afraid of it!

In a monthly review of the Midland Bank, the standard of living of the workers is referred to as follows:

"The figures show that a higher standard of living is to be found only among those workers who are lucky enough to have steady work. But everybody knows that many of those who live on wages have absolutely no work or do not work steadily. These people and their families live much worse than before the war. The fall of the standard of living of this group is so great that it equals or almost so the rise in wages of those who have steady jobs, so that the average living standard of people depending on wages may prove slightly above 1924, but not above 1913."

—(*Re-translated from Russian.*)

We have already pointed out that among the people living on wages are included government officials and directors, etc. This group always has work and receives salary increases. On the whole, however, the position of the majority of the working class has become worse as compared with 1924. We do not deal with the unemployment problem. Unemployment is increasing. About 50,000 new requests for unemployment pay are rejected monthly. Of a total number of 14 million workers, 15 per cent. are unemployed.

The Labour Government has already blessed the cotton workers with a wage cut of $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

There is an attack developing to achieve a 10 per cent. wage cut in the wool industry and

the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. cut on the railways is to be continued. The position of the workers in the mining industry has become so much worse that numerous small strikes are taking place indicating that the miners are in revolt.

The Government has favoured only the workers employed in the workshops of the army, the navy and the air force. There, workers will be paid for holidays. This particularly concerns the Woolwich Arsenal and other military enterprises of British imperialism. Here, too, the Labour Government continues the work of Baldwin. Altogether, one-and-a-half million people are paid for holidays in Great Britain. These are chiefly employees of State and municipal enterprises. Now the workers of the military enterprises are added to the list. Is not this a sign of the Labour Party's fascisation?

The coming of the Labour Government has hastened the growing activity of the labour movement, but has also let loose the capitalist offensive.

Just as the peasants' fight for land was resisted by the Socialist Revolutionary Ministry for Agriculture, and the workers' fights resisted by the Menshevik Labour Ministry in Russia in 1917, completely betrayed the counter-revolutionary essence of the Russian reformist parties in the eyes of the masses and showed the difference between the classes and their parties, so now the struggle of the workers, in spite of the Labour Party in power, will finally draw a dividing line between the Labour Party and imperialism on the one hand, and the working class on the other.

In Great Britain we are on the threshold of no less gigantic conflicts than in America.

Only the politically blind and deaf fail to notice this fact.

E.C.C.I. Activities

Problems of the French Communist Party

(SESSION OF THE POLITICAL SECRETARIAT HELD 6TH OCT., 1929).

THE WORK OF THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY.

(*From Semard's Report*).

IN order to appreciate our Party's political work during this last period, and the importance of the work which has already been accomplished, one has to examine its activity during two important political events: August 1st and the Congress of the Unitary Labour Confederation. In France August 1st was celebrated at a time of ferocious repression, under a régime of exceptional measures against Communist activity on the part of the Government of the bourgeois and the social democrats. In order to throw light on both its positive and its negative aspects, the first of August has to be examined during the period of its preparation, during the day itself, and during the days that followed. The object of such an examination and of the corresponding self-criticism is to correct the faults and weaknesses, and to take every measure for organisation and for the purging of the elements which during this period have been passive or have hindered the movement of the mass.

Passive tendencies have played their part in the preparations for August 1st, in a poor utilisation of the strike movement of that time, in hindrance by certain Communist and revolutionary syndicalist elements who declared that it was better to wait for August 1st before releasing the movements in the factories, or still worse, who openly sabotaged those movements by declaring themselves at variance with the Party policy and slogans for August 1st.

This bad spirit among certain comrades and a lack of initiative among others resulted in the industrial congresses in the various federations which had to prepare for the regional workers' and peasants' congresses being quite generally badly or insufficiently prepared in the factories. The workers' and peasants' congresses presented the same defects in their preparation and during their meetings; their tardy organisation was a hindrance to their being utilised in the agitation among the masses. This therefore

indicates that in our largest industrial regions our Party failed to carry out adequate mass work for the preparation of August 1st. Moreover, this failure in activity had its effect in the limited number of August 1st committees, and in the fact that no real groups of workers' defence were constituted. To the positive side of the preparation has to be put the excellent general agitation which our Party, and also the red T.U.'s and the revolutionary organisations under our Party's influence carried on (the Friends of Soviet Russia, the International Red Aid, the Women's League against War, etc.). This agitation was very deeply sown among the masses, with the result that not one worker who was in the least interested in social questions, not a factory was left indifferent to our agitation and to our slogans. Everywhere the action of our Party against the war and for the defence of the Soviet Union was being discussed, and that contributed to the development of our influence among the masses. But the feeble side, the chronic malady of our Party is its extreme weakness in the work of organisation.

So far as August 1st itself is concerned, it acquired a very great importance in France. Under our Party's direction hundreds of thousands of workers demonstrated in various ways. Throughout the country there were demonstrations which revealed a very high development of initiative, a higher political level of the workers in the struggle. In the chief industries such as mining and metallurgy, the stoppage of work was greater than that on the occasion of the day against the Moroccan war of Oct. 12th, 1925. The importance of this stoppage is also emphasised when the fact of the different conditions, of a more ferocious repression than that prevailing in 1925, and also the fact that the question of war impressed the workers less than at the time of war against the Rifis when many of the workers had sons in Morocco, are taken into account. We have drawn workers into the political struggle who have hitherto been impervious to demonstrations of a political nature; the railwaymen, the

gas workers, the navvies, the agricultural workers, the workers in public services. In certain large factories we have achieved good mass work. Thus in the Citroen factory a great ferment reigned all day in the workshops, work was broken off more than once and demonstrations carried out. In these demonstrations in the factories themselves and also for stopping work at eleven the sympathisers revealed a great initiative, sometimes putting themselves at the head of the activity.

Although Paris was without great mass demonstrations, on the other hand, there were important street demonstrations and serious battles with the police forces in the great provincial industrial cities, notably in Troyes and Lens. The resistance to the police was vigorous in the neighbourhood of the factories and in those factories where the management "had committed the indiscretion" of bringing the police in. This circumstance caused the local governments to avoid placing police at the gates of the factories in the afternoon, so as to prevent their having direct contact with the workers. During the day hundreds of thousands of demonstrating workers showed their sympathy with our struggle against the imperialist war; the masses were aroused as never before and the dangers of the imperialist war and of an attack on Soviet Russia appeared more clearly to them, while the rôle of social-imperialism and social fascism played by the socialists became still more evident. One may therefore regard August 1st as a serious step forward on the part of the working-class in revolutionary action against war under the leadership of the Communist Party. It also reveals that the class struggle has passed to a higher level. Both the preparation for and the day itself were rich in experience and in lessons both for our Party and for the working-class. Despite the weaknesses, our Party put forth a great effort; it multiplied its factory meetings, its dissemination of materials, its factory journals, etc., and displayed a greater initiative in its lower organs.

We have had a dress rehearsal of the repressive measures and police and military methods that the rulers will employ against the working-class in its revolutionary movements and during the next war. The working-class has had an opportunity of convincing itself by facts of the

justice of our Party's views as to the intensification of repression, and the readiness of the bourgeoisie and its rulers not to hang back before any means for realising their imperialist policy.

The more systematic and more ferocious repression, the fascist methods employed, the perfected system of preventive arrests and of preventive organisation to combat the "plot" against the security of the State revealed the resolute desire of the rulers to maintain an exceptional régime, a kind of State fascism against the proletariat and its revolutionary organisations.

In its attempt to break the movement the Government resorted to the mobilisation of all its forces; the combined forces of the bourgeoisie and the social-democrats, and their press unchained against Communism to the tune of millions of copies; also the concentration of the police and army forces. Paris was transformed into a veritable armed camp by the mobilisation of from 50,000 to 60,000 police and soldiers furnished with machine-guns, hand-grenades, tanks, etc.

The pretended triumph of the Government and their vociferations as to the fiasco of our movement deceived no one. All our class enemies had deliberately exaggerated our intentions in order to be able to speculate on our pretended setback. On the contrary, the failure of the bourgeoisie to checkmate the revolutionary movement is revealed in the fact that in announcing our fiasco, it advertised a further intensification of the repression. The rulers are continuing to organise a "plot," in other words, it is methodically working for our outlawry and for the suppression of our press and of 'L'Humanité' in particular. Moreover, the bourgeoisie is advertising new police powers, new super-soundrelly laws against Communism and special measures to protect the army from our propaganda.

On the positive side has to be placed the fact that August 1st contributed to the unmasking of the opportunists and the reformists in the Party and in the Unitary General Confederation of Labour. It certainly provided an excellent introduction to the latter's congress. The reformists of various shades still in the Party ranks and in the red T.U.s have joined forces with the syndicalist league and the Trotskyists

in sabotaging August 1st, and have proved themselves equal to the worst of social-democrats in the socialist party and the General Confederation of Labour. They employed the same methods of resistance, the same defeatist and counter-revolutionary proposals in their struggle against August 1st and against Communism. Their attitude, which became still more definite during the preparations for the Confederation Congress, assisted the Party in its work of purging its ranks.

We now have to examine the negative sides.

Whilst on the one hand we saw non-party sympathisers taking very great initiative, certain Communists remained passive and held back the activity of the class. Some certainly carried out a twenty-four hours' strike, but left it at that without accomplishing the tasks which the Party had laid down of drawing the workers out of the factories. Yet others remained completely inactive, even going so far as to conceal their membership of the Party. Thus we had literal deserters who added to the bad work of the opportunist and reformist elements we have above denounced.

The street demonstrations in Paris were very feeble. The most important demonstrations occurred in the immediate suburbs, especially at Argenteuil, the reasons for this being as I have above indicated, and also the absence of workers' defence corps which would have been the motive power in directing and protecting the demonstrations.

Before August 1st we carried out quite good anti-militarist work, during the manœuvres at Mailly camp for instance, and deserved the following appreciative remarks of the "France Militaire" for August 16th: "Everything was done by the staff to achieve the maximum of efficiency at the Mailly manœuvres. . . . And the efficiency of these manœuvres has been diminished because the Communists prefer to obey their orders from Moscow. That is a very appreciable result for the Communists, whose dream it is to organise a civil war . . . In the Mailly camp there were two groups susceptible to their injurious activity: the reservists and a native brigade of cavalry. The Communists were not slow in carrying out an intensive anti-militarist propaganda through their journal 'The Barracks,' and in the case of the second group through a sheet which was called the

'Spahi'." But this excellent anti-militarist work had declined during the period immediately preceding August 1st, and we did not have sufficient effect on the troops brought to Paris. The political orientation of the work in the army was poor owing to the fact that it was based solely on the economic claims of the soldiers, and not on the political problems of the struggle against the imperialist war and to defend the Soviet Union. This brought August 1st to a certain class rupture between the workers and the soldiers.

Our weakness in organisation and in illegal work involved a series of consequences: the invasion of the Villeneuve conference and the arrest of the militants. Inexperience in illegal work led to certain of our organs and certain militants protecting the organisation or themselves so badly that it was impossible to make rapid contact with them, and in certain places even impossible to discover their place of "retreat."

All these negative aspects have imposed on our Party the urgent necessity of examining the state of the Party organisation and the immediate tasks that have to be undertaken in order to remedy it. This has also raised the necessity of pursuing a stern work of purging the bad elements.

The same tendencies towards passivity were found on the days following August 1st. There were those who thought that August 1st had been a peak point in the proletarians' struggle and that it ought to be followed by a period of calm. Others did not believe in the "plot," maintained that it was not seriously to be considered, and even saw in it a little "pleasantry" of the ruling classes.

The attack on the Peasants' Bank was first and foremost an attack on the "Humanité" and on the Party with a view to their suppression, and the opportunist elements directing the bank and the "Humanité" editors have to be severely censured for the false line which they published in our journal despite the instructions from the Party centre. The severe punishment of dismissal from the "Humanité" was applied against the six editors who were brought before the Central Control Commission to answer for their lack of discipline.

The centre of our activity against repression must be an energetic struggle for the Party's and

the C.G.T.U.'s open existence, the sustained defence of "Humanité" whilst giving to the "plot" all its significance of being an attack with a view to decapitating and destroying the proletariats' revolutionary organisations and the Communist Party first and foremost.

That leads us to say that during the period immediately past the struggle for the open existence of the Party and the C.G.T.U. has been inadequate. Our organisations and many of our comrades have not understood the Government manœuvre, which consists in putting the central direction of the Party in a position of illegality and in precipitating the general illegality of the Party. A misunderstanding of this situation leads to there being a tendency to slide too easily into illegality. That is the result of romantic conspiratorial activity, and furthermore, it is the line of least resistance!

Our lower organs, our leaders of various sections have not correctly applied our instructions which proclaimed the maximum of open life and activity, which indicated that the repressive activities of the rulers must be resisted by all means in our power, that we must cling to all the possibilities of legality, must struggle foot by foot for the legality of the Party and the C.G.T.U., whilst intensifying our public activities in the factories and locally (the holding of meetings, reports of representatives, the organisation of committees in defence of "Humanité" in the factories, factory collections, organisation of committees of struggle for wages, etc.).

This legal activity must be pursued systematically simultaneously with the reorganisation of our illegal work and its apparatus.

* * * *

The second fact of political importance is the Congress of the Unitary Confederation of Labour.

This congress marks an important step towards the liquidation of anarchist-syndicalist and pure syndicalist traditions among the French workers' movement. It marks a decisive step towards the effective realisation of the directing rôle of the Party.

At this congress a vigorous struggle was waged against the unmasked opportunists and reformists. It compelled these elements to abandon their generalities and to determine their social-democratic positions.

It is necessary to recall that at our Party congress in 1929 Crozet alone openly developed a social-democratic argument; at the C.G.T.U. congress quite a number of reformists made clear their social-democratic basis. They declared that there was a prospect of forty years of capitalist stability, that the immanence of war was a Communist invention, that rationalisation favoured general prosperity; one of them went so far as to declare that it was of advantage to the workers, and that he was in agreement with Fordism. They declared that the workers were exhausted, that there was no leftward movement among them, and expressed their disdain of the unorganised workers. Their reformist position is that of the General Confederation of Labour; in the C.G.T.U. congress they were the spokesmen of the reformist C.G.T. which was holding its congress at the same time, and whose leaders had the same appreciation of the situation in France. Their resistance to the revolutionary action of the masses is affirmed by their refusal to accentuate the political level of the workers' movement, and by their struggle against the directing rôle of the Party, which they have attacked like the worst of social-democrats.

Furthermore, like the social-democrats, they sabotaged August 1st. For example, the Ports and Dockworkers' Federation addressed a circular to its unions demanding that they should not participate in the "adventure of August 1st." The Teachers' Union of Finistère adopted exactly the same attitude; they declared against August 1st, which, they said, was "a policy of adventures, dictated by Stalin." Deneyer, the secretary of the "Book-paper" Union of Roubaix-Tourcoing went so far as to declare that "all those who strike on August 1st will be excluded from the union."

All this reformist rabble which was revealed as counter-revolutionary was in perfect accord with the syndicalist league and its organ: "The Revolution Proletarianne," with the Trotskyist Journal: "Contre le Courant" which set the line for all the union minority against August 1st. It was a genuine attempt of the minority to draw the C.G.T.U. into reformism which was continued and extended at the C.G.T.U. congress. There the minority openly demanded that the engines should be reversed in order to avoid repression. Boville, speaking in the name of that minority, thus expressed himself: "Let

us turn the helm to the right, let us not go any more to the left, for there lies the danger and thus we shall prevent repression from falling on the C.G.T.U. and its militants." In other words: "We'll give up our revolutionary activities, and orientate towards a purely reformist activity which will shelter us from the repressive laws, the brute force of the bourgeoisie, and the rulers."

The majority of the C.G.T.U. responded by demanding on the contrary a step forward in the development of revolutionary action, a step forward in the masses' struggle under the direction of the Communist Party, the only Party leading the working-class.

After five days of debates the result was that 943 unions and 1,512 votes were cast for the revolutionary majority, and 148 unions with 214 vote supported the reformists. It is worth while pointing out the attitude of the social-democrats of the "Populaire" and the "Peuple," who acted from outside solidly with the reformist minority. The "Populaire" wrote: "The minority has had enough of the Muscovite knout. . . There has been a real attempt to liberate the unitary T.U. movement from the political pressure of the Bolshevik party which it is for us to assist." This declaration underlines the social-imperialists' hope of seeing the revolutionary movement disintegrate and of their gathering the fruits of that disintegration.

To the positive side has also to be put Comrade Cachin's intervention in the name of our Party Central Committee. This intervention is of considerable importance when the traditions of the French T.U. movement are recalled; for instance, the trade unionists adopted "The Amiens Charter" in order to protect the T.U. movement from the political penetration which the Guedists of those times wished to pursue.

This congress presented a clearer programme of demands than have those preceding it, and one based on the struggle against capitalist rationalisation and upon the organisation and struggle of the masses for immediate demands. Finally, the leadership of the C.G.T.U. has been rejuvenated whilst being strengthened and consolidated.

In order to ensure their correction it is necessary to indicate the weaknesses of the congress.

During the preparations for the congress the discussion was too much confined to the central and intermediary organisations. Where the lower organisations discussed August 1st they did not sufficiently link it up with preparations for the C.G.T.U. congress.

The struggle carried on against the right wingers was too long delayed. It ended with expulsions on the very eve of the congress, expulsions which were not justified to the assembled workers; to the assembled unions directed by these right-wingers; and consequently there was a lack of clarity as to the destructive activity of these elements, and so they were not condemned by the workers as they should have been.

The unorganised elements were not sufficiently interested in the preparations for the congress, and there was no representation of these elements at the congress. It has to be said that even in our own ranks and in those of the unions we have not yet overcome the lack of comprehension which prevails on this capital question, and a serious elucidation of the discussions and decisions of the Tenth Plenum on this issue has still to be realised throughout the Party and throughout the C.G.T.U.

There was too much "democracy" in regard to the minority which allowed them to sabotage the congress to the detriment of the examination of the principal issue. Five days were taken up solely by the discussion of the report on activities.

The question of organising the workers' struggles, of creating committees of struggle and factory committees, of conquering the great factories and industries from below, the question of developing the political level of the struggles and of organising self-defence in the factories were merely skimmed over. That was one great weakness of the congress which ought to be rapidly corrected by holding a national council which will go more thoroughly into these questions, and will determine more definite tasks.

The question of defending the legality of the unions, which goes hand in hand with that of defending the legality of the Party was not discussed as it should have been, especially if it be borne in mind that the reaction of the unions after the blows struck by the ruling classes at the

Villeneuve conference and at the proposed Clichy congress was very far from adequate.

Following on this congress, which despite its weaknesses marked a considerable change and a great step forward towards the conquest of the masses and the direction of their struggles by the Communist Party, a great educational campaign should have been pursued among the lower organisational groups, whilst simultaneously a serious organisational activity should have developed in the factories.

In particular, impetus should be given to discussion of the rôle of the reformists. It is now necessary to hunt them down in their own organisations.

But this question of the struggle against the reformists in the T.U. movement raises the whole problem of the struggle to be pursued against the right-wingers in the Party and in the organisations directed and influenced by them. It is quite certain that not all the opportunists are unmasked. Many of them have not yet pronounced their views on August 1st or on the decisions of the Tenth Plenum. For instance, the purging of the "Humanité" revealed that for two years the editors charged with applying the Party policy had been in complete disagreement with it. The recent events in the mayoralty of Clichy, where a majority of Communist municipal councillors revolted against the Party decisions, also emphasise these political disagreements. The struggle against the right-wingers in the Party has to be continued, but we must make our greatest efforts in the T.U. movement itself. There the cleansing acquires a distinctive character. There the methods used in the Party must not be adopted. It is not a question of expelling but of unmasking the reformist elements, of chasing them out of the union leadership and of wresting their troops from them.

In order to struggle against the reformist minority in the C.G.T.U. we must of course denounce the social-democratic attitude common to all their varieties, we must denounce their traditionalist and confusionist tendencies as well as their methods of struggle against the Communist Party and the C.G.T.U., methods which are identical with those of the social-democrats.

But that minority must not be regarded as though it were constituted organically. We

must recognise its diverse tendencies and their influence amongst the various categories of workers.

These tendencies, or better speaking, these shades are composed of the following elements :

1. The Syndicalist League, with its organ the "Révolution Proletarienne," which is the basis of a real anti-Communist Party and which brings together the majority of the politically divided Trotskyist elements. Its unionist militants are Engler, of the local union of Rouen dockers, Germaine Goujon, of the local Textile Union of Rouen, Chambellan, of the local Book-keepers' Union of the Seine Province, Carbit and Charroin of the local Type Union of the Seine Province, Mahouy and Roy of the Metal Workers' sections of the Seine Province. All these reformist elements have charge of and influence over the local unions mentioned.

2. The group of those recently expelled from the Party who are not yet organically connected with the Syndicalist League. Its unionist militants are Boville of the Food Workers' Federation, who possesses a 55 per cent. majority in his union, Bour of the Ports and Dockworkers' Federation, Deveaux, of the T.C.R.P. Union with a majority of 80 per cent., and Bonnamour, of the Gasworkers' Union with a minority of 40 per cent.

3. Finally, there are the "savages," the anarchistically minded or "pure" unionists, all long avowed reformists among the opposition and not connected with the Syndicalist League. The union elements are Schumacher, in a minority in the Books Federation, Rembeaud at the head of a small minority of the State railway workers, Herman and Su, who were beaten at their last national council and are in a minority in the Glass Workers' Federation, Cornec and Thomas of the Teachers' Federation who have influence with a third of that organisation.

It is also worth remarking that the Syndicalist League has not developed any more since the C.G.T.U. Bordeaux congress, that it has not gained either in active workers or in staff. It is possible that its numbers may be swelled by a few expelled from the Party, but it will be very difficult to bring all this minority together organically.

If any regrouping is achieved it will be partial and will be effected inside the Syndicalist League.

Nor is there any likelihood of unity being achieved among the minority called the "Communist opposition," which operates on the political plane. There also several small groups claim to represent Trotskyism.

1. The "Verité," Rosmer's organ, claims to unify the opposition. Rosmer is Trotsky's official representative in France. "Contre le Courant" declares that it is the organ of Trotskyist orthodoxy and affirms its disagreement with Rosmer. Rosmer for his part is in disagreement with "Contre le Courant," and the other Trotskyist molecules and is on cold terms with the "Revolution Proletarienne." Rosmer has no forces behind him.

2. "Contre le Courant," which is the organ of Paaz, Lucie Coliard and Magdeleine Marx, declares its disagreement with Trotsky on the question of the Chinese Eastern Railway. It almost accuses Trotsky of being as "imperialistic" as Stalin. It accuses him of introducing the methods of the Comintern into the opposition (*sic*). There are no forces behind this molecule.

3. The "Lutte de Classe" directed by the barrister Fourrier, who has been excluded from the Party. This super-realist organ defends Trotskyism in sentimental fashion. There are no longer any forces behind this journal, but since the purge carried out by the Party in Alsace-Lorraine, Fourrier, who was the counsel for the autonomists, has been attempting to gather the Alsace-Lorraine expelled members around him.

4. "L'Unité Leniniste" directed by Treint, which has not appeared for some time, is an intermittent opposition without forces. Suzanne Girault, who was allied with Treint, has for some time now declared her agreement with the Party policy and is demanding her reinstatement.

5. Souvarine's "Le Bulletin Communiste," an organ which appears intermittently, and which with its editor has lost all credit with the working-class.

All these Trotskyist molecules have no real influence either in the Party or among the masses. Only the "Revolution Proletarienne" and the Syndicalist League play the rôle of

ideological assembler of the social-democratic and Trotskyist minorities in the unions.

We must not assist in the organic organisation of this minority, but must disintegrate it, must smash it in detail in its own positions. We must show the workers that it represents anarchy in thought and in method, and is incapable of sound decision and is completely incapable of directing the workers' movement in the revolutionary path.

We shall smash this minority by our initiative, by our methodical work in organising and directing the workers' struggles.

Inside the Party the same task of cleansing the ranks is being actively carried on. Our nuclei are discussing August 1st and the attitude of the members on the following basis: "What have you done in preparation for August 1st? what has been your rôle on August 1st?" These discussions are being carried on in meetings enlarged by the addition of the sympathetic elements which we have to bring into adherence to our Party. After the political discussion the revision commissions propose to apply punitive measures against those who have not done all their duty as Communists.

Thus, parallel with the cleansing of our Party we are pursuing a recruiting campaign among the best fighters for August 1st. We are attempting to recruit the "promotion of the 10,000" which should allow us through recruiting new forces to improve the social composition of our Party, which still leaves much to be desired owing to the large number of worker specialists. We are organically consolidating our Party as the Tenth Plenum demanded. This consolidation is already evident in the renewing of our cadres in various sections: the nuclei, sub-districts, districts and areas. The governing elements of our most important areas: the Paris, Northern, Eastern and Bordeaux areas have been renewed and strengthened. The Central Committee, the Political Bureau and the Party Secretariat have also been strengthened by the co-option of new elements. The governing elements of the C.G.T.U. have also been strengthened by the entry of young and advanced groups. The "Humanité" has been purged and its directing body strengthened. Finally, a closer collaboration has been established with the Young Communists and common action has been undertaken to re-align this

organisation ; a re-alignment which operated at the recent Youth congress by the correction of the line in the anti-militarist work, and by the struggle against the legalistic tendency which demanded the winding up of the Workers' Sports Federation and the re-entry of its elements into the bourgeois sports organisations ; also by the struggle to ensure that the Young Communists should become a genuine mass organisation.

The work of Communist re-alignment has still to be carried out in the organisations under Party influence ; the co-operatives, the Friends of Soviet Russia, the A.R.A.C., the Association of War Combatants, etc.

Our great weakness is the problem of cadres. We foresee district and area schools in order politically to shape the cadres, which actually constitute a big defect in our Party.

All this direction of our work shows that our Party has already applied in practice the decisions of the Tenth Plenum, and the last Central Committee has unanimously approved those decisions. It has decided upon their discussion in the Party and their popularisation among the worker masses.

The same Central Committee examined the situation after August 1st, and laid down the

immediate tasks. It perfectly realised the weaknesses in the organisation of our Party, and it is endeavouring to press the entire Party and all the members of the Party into the work of correcting these weaknesses : by strengthening the Party and union organisation in the great enterprises and in the industries from below. By making the mass work more active and also that of winning the unorganised, by the organisation of a single front at the factories on the basis of wage demands and the formation of committees of struggle. By organising groups of workers' defence in the factories and on a local basis. By methodically preparing the Party for illegality. Certainly these tasks demand a great effort from our Party. It must prove that in the organisational sphere it has the same capabilities as in the realm of agitation. We can definitely say that the Party is really on the Bolshevik road, that it more and more appears to the worker masses as their sole guide, as the sole organisation which can lead them into the immediate struggles as well as into the decisive struggle against the bourgeoisie. The accomplishment of the tasks which have already been laid down will render the Party capable of carrying through the great revolutionary tasks with which it is confronted.

The Fight for the New Line

By J.F.

THE last few issues of the *Communist Review* reflect the struggle that is going on in the Communist Party of Great Britain for the new line. It is true that the discussion that is now going on in the Party does not find expression in the magazine to the extent that it should. But every issue contains either official resolutions or articles by leading comrades—in the process of “self-criticism”—which review past errors and urge the necessity for a radical change in the policy and tactics of the Party in the present period.

The contents of these articles and documents give us an insight also into the manner in which the fight for the new line is going on in the course of the practical work of the Party, in the effort independently to lead the workers in their everyday struggles in opposition to the sabotage

of the reformist bureaucracy. A certain lack of clarity is to be observed here concerning some of the important problems that now confront the Party.

The August number contains an article by Comrade Ferguson giving a critical analysis of the conduct of the struggle in the Dawdon miners' strike, and in the September number, Comrade Graham gives a somewhat less critical account of the Party's share in the cotton lock-out. Both these accounts prove conclusively that the direct approach to the masses calls forth a sympathetic response and proves the correctness and practicability of the new line. Comrade Ferguson tells us that when the Party entered into the Dawdon struggle there was not a single Party member in the district and no contacts whatever existed with the miners. In

the lock-out area in Lancashire, Comrade Graham informs us the Party forces were also very weak and even of these only a small proportion were in the cotton trade.

The cotton lock-out was of too short duration to enable the Party to develop its campaign, although this testifies to the lack of preparation in the period when the struggle was already looming ahead. Nevertheless, from Comrade Graham's account it appears that the activity of the Party during the short period of the lock-out met with a good response among the textile workers and that a number of recruits were made for the Party.

In the Dawdon struggle the Party within a short time succeeded in establishing an organisation and, while formally the strike was being conducted by the official trade union, the actual leader of the struggle was the Party. Comrade Ferguson admits that one of the principal weaknesses of the leadership of the struggle was the failure to get an unofficial strike committee elected and he gives three reasons why this was not done: "Firstly, the workers had not yet lost confidence in their officials; secondly, the Party had no alternative leadership to offer from within the miners' organisation and thirdly, a certain reluctance was shown by our comrades on the spot to expose the local officials." The last reason sufficiently explains the first two; for in spite of the first two reasons, our Party after all did succeed actually in leading the strike. Determined exposure of the local trade union bureaucrats could have removed the two first-mentioned obstacles and organisational leadership also could have been wrenched from the hands of the trade union bureaucrats. The fact remains that the decisive strategical position which our comrades allowed to remain in the hands of the union officials enabled the latter, after fifteen weeks of struggle actually led by the Party, finally to sabotage the strike.

In both accounts there is revealed this hesitancy to come out openly against the trade union bureaucracy and a tendency to conceal the direct leadership of the Party. Comrade Graham relates that the "Lock-out Special," which was published by the Party and had a good sale among the locked out textile workers, did not speak in the name of the Party, but "purely in the voice of the cotton workers." Comrade Ferguson relates that after six weeks of per-

sistent reformist treachery, slogans were issued—in the name of the Minority Movement it is true—on the lines of the slogan "Make Your Leaders Fight" It is clear from Comrade Ferguson's account that the application of the new line in the Dawdon strike was hampered by the strong survivals of the old line in the leadership.

Another important weakness revealed in the conduct of these struggles was the inability to link up the immediate industrial struggles with the general political struggles of the Communist Party, and especially with the struggle against the Labour Party. Comrade Graham relates that the "Lock-out Special":

"Put forward the immediate demands, gave the correct slogans of the immediate struggle, but failed entirely to link up the transitional demands with the revolutionary aim of capturing power and overthrowing the bourgeois State which is incumbent upon us when the revolutionary tide is rising."

This, however, was rectified later on. Comrade Ferguson states that:

"The election struggle had an important influence on the Dawdon struggle. It diverted attention from the fundamental questions and assisted the officials to screen their treachery . . . The General Election militated against us and assisted the officials to maintain the leadership of the struggle and carry through their defeatist policy."

The General Election occurred right in the midst of the Dawdon struggle. Dawdon is part of the Seaham Harbour constituency in which Comrade Pollitt, the leader of the Dawdon struggle, stood as the Communist candidate against MacDonald, the very personification of social reformism. Would such an election struggle "divert" attention from fundamental questions or "militate against us" if it were conducted properly and linked up with the industrial struggle?

These two questions of independent Party leadership and the linking up of everyday struggles with the general struggle come to the front also in another connection, namely, the relation between the Party and the Minority Movement. For example, Comrade Ferguson in his article on the Dawdon strike states that a desire was expressed to issue the first strike bulletin in the name of the Minority Movement

and that the Tyneside District Party Committee opposed this as a Right Wing tendency. "This bulletin," says Comrade Ferguson,

"We were advised to issue in the name of the Minority Movement and not the Party, but in rejecting this viewpoint, the District Committee made it clear that it intended entering the struggle guided by the new line and not the old."

This question has given rise to a very serious discussion in the Party as to who is to lead the working-class in its industrial struggles, the Party or the Minority Movement; whether it is the function of the Party to lead industrial struggles or to leave that to the Minority Movement and itself engage in the "general political struggle"; whether the Party must lead the whole movement or share the leadership with the Minority Movement. In the July number of the *Communist Review*, Comrade Murphy wrote concerning the new tasks in the trade union movement as follows:

"It is now no longer possible to be associated with the old idea that a new General Council of Trade Unions is all that is required. The Minority Movement itself must be the centre of trade unionism, just as the Communist Party stands forth as the alternative leadership of the working class in the fight against the forces of the Labour Party." . . .

The Minority Movement . . . "must now not only put forward its policy but be prepared to lead the fight for its policy direct from the factories and mines" . . .

"Instead of the fight in the unions being the principle, it is now an auxiliary struggle supplementary to the direct leadership of the fight by the Party and the Minority Movement. The new leadership of the British working-class will not come either from the Labour Party or from the trade unions. It will come through the direct leadership of the working class fight by the Communist Party and the Minority Movement."

In these few lines we have the statement of the indubitably correct general idea of the necessity of wrenching the leadership of the labour movement from the hands of the "Labour Party" and of the General Trade Union Council and apparently an argument for the division of the "spheres of influence," and for the sharing of the leadership between the Party and the Minority

Movement. Since that was written, however, Comrade Murphy has severely criticised the Minority Movement for not having at its last conference, openly declared its allegiance and subordination to the Communist Party.

This reflects a rather formal approach to the question of independent leadership. It appears as if the essential thing is that the Party should proclaim itself the leader. Of course, if the Party conceals its identity behind a pseudonym, it will never be recognised as the leader; but the mere proclamation of its leadership does not get it recognised as the leader. If the Minority Movement carries out a wrong policy it shows that it is not being properly led by the Party; if the Party leads the Minority Movement properly, the latter will link up its conduct of the everyday struggles with the general working class struggle. As Comrade R. P. Dutt says in an article in the September number of the *Communist Review* on "The Fight for Independent Leadership":

"Our claim to leadership is not established by repetition of the claim, but depends upon our ability to lead," and we would add, upon the willingness to lead. The resolution of the Central Committee of the British Party on the Tenth Plenum, published in the September number of the *Communist Review*, puts the matter more clearly. It says:

"The fundamental change in the Party's trade union tactics consists in the fact that the Party and the Minority Movement, which is under its leadership, do not confine themselves to working in the reformist unions in order to criticise the bureaucracy, to bring pressure on them to lead struggles, to carry on revolutionary propaganda and to put forward candidates for trade union positions as in the past, but advance to the task of organising and leading the independent economic and political struggles of the workers against the will of the bureaucracy. The mass organs for leading the struggles of the workers under the leadership of the Party are Committees of Action, Factory Committees and conferences of factory and pit delegates . . . In order to effectively struggle in the factories and in the union branches for the leadership of the working-class, the Party must assist in the organisation of all sympathetic workers

(including the unorganised) in the Minority Movement."

It seems to us that correct mutual relations between the Party and the Minority Movement should be neither division of leadership, nor formal subordination of the Minority Movement to the Communist Party. The Communist Party must take into its own hands the leadership of the whole movement of the working-class, the political and economic alike. The Minority Movement, as the centre of the revolutionary trade union movement, must be the driving belt through which the Communist Party exercises its influence on the masses, and must actually be under the leadership of the Communist Party. With the mutual relations between the Communist Party and the Minority Movement properly defined, it will not be difficult to decide the question of direct leadership of industrial struggles. These must be directly led by Committees of Action, elected by all the workers of the given enterprise on the basis of a class platform. Good continuous work by the Party and Minority Movement among the mass of the workers will be a guarantee that the personal composition of the Committee of Action and also their functions will outwardly correspond with the line of the Party. Thus the general leadership, of industrial struggles by the Party will be guaranteed.

In the article in the September number of the *Communist Review* mentioned previously, Comrade Dutt enumerates eight types of the Right tendency in England :—

(1) Over-estimation of capitalist stabilisation and working class depression and incorrect treatment of the significance of the General Strike ;

(2) Scepticism of the independent line of the Party and of the present line of the Comintern and the Profintern ;

(3) Building up of illusions in Left Social Democracy ;

(4) Passivity and legalism in trade union questions ;

(5) Passivity on the question of the daily paper ;

(6) Attribution of Party weakness and limited influence solely to objective conditions or organising causes without consideration of faults of the political line ;

(7) Failure of adequate discussion and self-criticism and even discouragement of such ;

(8) Failure to draw new forces into the leading work of the Party.

"The Right danger," says Comrade Dutt, "when it is open and openly expressed, is most easily fought because it is in manifest opposition to the international line. But the greatest danger is when the Right endeavours to conceal its opposition under the form of acceptance, i.e., conciliationism. This is the principal danger upon which we must concentrate our fight."

In regard to the acceptance of the decisions of the Comintern, the discussion which has gone on in the *Communist Review* since last March between Comrade Campbell and Comrade Joss regarding the stabilisation of British capitalism is of extreme interest. Comrade Campbell, while accepting the general estimation of the stabilisation of present-day capitalism made by the Sixth Congress, nevertheless insists that the part of the resolution which refers to Great Britain does not now apply ; that during the lapse of time since that resolution was written certain changes had taken place in the economic position of Great Britain which makes the description of British capitalism in that part of the resolution "inaccurate and one-sided" (July issue). He claims that the decline noted in previous years has been arrested, and writes :

"The decline in British production and British export trade has, in the main, been arrested and the capitalist class are mobilising for a rationalisation drive in the course of which it is not impossible that they may be able, like the capitalist class in other countries, to increase production over its pre-war level."

In proof of his contention, Comrade Campbell points to the increase in British production and exports during this year. And the conclusion he draws from this is that the increase in production accompanied by the rationalisation drive will cause the workers to emerge from their previous state of depression and commence a counter-offensive against the capitalist class. Comrade Campbell therefore urges that his estimation of British capitalism is by no means an expression of a Right tendency but rather that it opens up the perspective of acute class struggles.

To this Comrade Joss replied that Comrade Campbell's position implied a revision of the resolutions of the Sixth World Congress and of the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain ; that it was "a definite over-estimation of capitalist stabilisation in Great Britain" (August issue). Comrade Joss showed that Comrade Campbell based his case on an increase in British production in the first quarter of this year of .9 per cent. and of .7 per cent in British exports which is insignificant compared with the increase of production and exports of Germany and the United States. He argued that the position of British capitalism cannot be estimated on the basis of these figures alone, as Campbell does, but that the

"decline of British capitalism is not only relative but absolute to the development of world capitalism in general and to German and U.S.A. capitalism in particular"; that the position which Campbell is now taking up 'is back to the period prior to the Ninth Plenum and the old line'; "

a justification of the old theory of the "depression among the working-class" upon which the whole of the Right policy of the Party was based.

Comrade Dutt showed up the inconsistency of Comrade Campbell in a footnote to his article already mentioned when he pointed out that on Campbell's own showing, British production increased from 100 in the first quarter of 1924 to 109.3 in the first quarter of 1928, that is the figures upon which the estimation of the Sixth Congress was based. Yet Comrade Campbell does not question the correctness of the Sixth Congress estimation of British capitalism for that period but demands its revision on the grounds of a much smaller increase in the first part of this year. Comrade Dutt writes :

"If an advance of 100 to 109.3 did not invalidate the Sixth Congress thesis, why does a subsequent advance of 109.3 to 110.2 invalidate it? If on the other hand, the advance of 109.3 to 110.2 does invalidate the analysis of a 'continuous decline,' then much more so did the advance of 100 to 109.3 invalidate it when it was written. In other words, under the form of alleging a change of conditions, Comrade Campbell is in reality attacking the Sixth Congress thesis as incorrect, both now and when it was written."

In spite of this, Comrade Campbell, in the same issue (September) declares in regard to his estimate "I am not only unrepentant, I am correct."

This apparently is the last word in this discussion, as there is no rejoinder in the October issue. It would be interesting to know Comrade Campbell's opinion now when the "boom" in British capitalism has come to a sudden end with the recent Stock Exchange smash which revealed that a very important part of the rationalisation drive was just a huge financial speculation. The important question is, however, does he accept the resolution of the Sixth Congress and of the Tenth Plenum with all their implications or not?

In view of the serious problems that now confront the British Party and in view of the forthcoming Party Congress at which these problems will have to be decided, one would be led to expect that the October number of the *Communist Review* would be chock full of discussion matter, especially as this number is advertised in the "Workers' Life" as being "of special importance in view of the discussion now going on in the Party." But these expectations are not realised and from this aspect the October number is disappointing. As a matter of fact it contains only two articles that can be considered as discussion matter and only one of these is placed in the section entitled "Party Discussion."

One article is by Comrade Pollitt on the "Tenth Plenum Lessons," in which he reviews the mistakes committed by the Party in the past and stresses the need for a radical change in accordance with the line of the Comintern. Pollitt writes :

"In this situation it is not difficult to see how important the British Party is to the Communist International and why at the Tenth Plenum the inner-Party situation occupied so much attention in the speeches of every leading comrade in the International . . . This means that our obligations to the Communist International and the whole world revolutionary movement, particularly in the colonies, are the most responsible of any section. It is this fact that aroused the sharp criticism of the Tenth Plenum, because it was felt that we were not fulfilling these obligations. . . . But the difficulty of the International was in trying to see exactly which forces in

the existing leadership were the most capable for this and which comrades, as a result of a careful examination over this period, could be said to represent most clearly the tendencies in contradiction to the line demanded by the Communist International and the objective situation at home . . . We are not making the progress that the situation and the Communist International demands."

Comrade Pollitt admits that the leadership of the Party hitherto has shown a Right tendency, but he claims that these tendencies were to be observed also in the districts and local organisations of the Party. He quotes Comrade Molotov's statement at the Tenth Plenum about the Right danger in the British Party that "in regard to the struggle against the Right and conciliatory elements we have not yet arrived at sufficient clarity in this Party" and adds that "the greatest danger lies in accepting in words the Sixth Congress decisions but not carrying them out in the daily work of the Party."

Comrade Pollitt states that—

"an examination of the policy of the Party since the end of the miners' lock-out in 1926 clearly shows that the line has been a Right line" . . . "And after the Ninth Plenum we still continue to carry into our daily work the old line."

Among the reasons why the Party has not made the progress it should have done Comrade Pollitt gives that of the absence of a daily paper. He writes :

"The biggest weakness the Party is faced with in its struggles is the absence of a daily paper."

He admits that the resolution of the Central Committee of the Party accepting the decisions of the Tenth Plenum, in that part concerning the daily paper, was inadequate and that it was strongly criticised by the Political Secretariat of the Comintern. The Central Committee resolution published in the September number states :

"Whether the Party earnestly means to carry out the above tasks will be shown by what is done to establish a national daily . . . The publication of a daily by January 1st is the supreme task which must be pushed to the forefront in all our campaigns" . . . This gigantic task "can only be accomplished by the mobilisation of all Party members and

sympathisers in building up a capital fund and in securing lists of subscribers for the paper."

The Political Secretariat's correction to this resolution, which Comrade Pollitt quotes, says :

"The Party therefore should begin with a big political campaign amongst the widest sections of the workers and undertake a systematic collection of workers' pennies as a means of making the daily really the workers' own paper."

And Comrade Pollitt adds : "The fight for the daily paper becomes the real fight against the Right danger and for the independent leadership of the Party, for it ends passivity, apathy and hesitation."

But is it doing so ? In the middle of October there were no signs yet of the "big political campaign" and the fight for the daily paper is still confined to the issuing of collection sheets to Party members and the propaganda of the slogan : "If you want a daily, increase the circulation of the 'Workers' Life'."

We must recall Comrade Pollitt's own statement that "the greatest danger lies in accepting in words the Sixth Congress decisions, but not carrying them out in the daily work of the Party."

In view of the fact that the C.C. of the British Party was somewhat slow in adapting itself to the line of the Comintern that it failed to apply it with sufficient consistency and failed to display sufficient initiative in the development of self-criticism, several local organisations proved to be in advance of it in regard to self-criticism. This is reflected in Comrade Ferguson's introduction to the statement on "Policy and Leadership" drawn up by the Tyneside District Party Committee published in the "Party Discussion" section of the October issue. Comrade Ferguson writes :

"Hitherto all important correctives came from the Communist International, while within the C.P.G.B. there existed a paralysing political passivity and inertia born of a blind and false loyalty to the C.E.C. whose leads, right or wrong, were uncritically accepted and operated." . . .

"For the first time in the history of the British Party a responsible district committee drew up a political statement on the policy and leadership of the Party, drawing attention to the serious decline in membership and

influence, indicating the main causes of this decline and calling for a special national congress to effect a radical change in national policy and leadership." . . .

"This awakening is the healthiest manifestation, not of the so-called 'crisis,' but of the Bolshevisation of the British Party which is now commencing for the first time in real earnest."

If this awakening of which Comrade Ferguson speaks is accompanied by a thorough discussion of the root causes of the Right danger, by a clarification of the essentials of the new line and by a real determination, not only to accept, but to carry out the new line, then the most important premises for the Bolshevisation of the British Communist Party and its conversion into a mass Party will have been created.

The Development of the Revolutionary Class Struggle in Germany

THE Wedding Party Congress and the Tenth Enlarged Executive stated in their resolutions, that the accentuation of imperialist and class contradictions, on a world scale, was proceeding at an accelerated rate. The events which have occurred in Germany since that statement was made fully bear out its correctness.

The German trust bourgeoisie, assisted by its supporters of various shades and colours, has directed its entire policy towards re-establishing its former position as a world power. The capitalists are trying to achieve this object by means of a violent attack, accompanied by methods of fascist oppression, on the living conditions and political rights of the workers.

The advance of German imperialism and the carrying out of the Young Plan require a further great increase in German exports and an intensification of the measures of rationalisation. This leads to increased world competition. The German bourgeoisie is systematically preparing itself for greater difficulties in regard to imperialist hostilities. The burdens of the Young Plan and of the State's increasing need of money to meet the huge expenses of military armaments, to maintain the police, the judicial service and all the other institutions which serve to suppress the revolutionary workers, to finance the reactionary and social fascist organisations, are ruthlessly transferred on to the shoulders of the working-class. The industrial magnates are not prepared to surrender even the smallest part of their profits for the

purpose of carrying out the Young Plan. For them this plan is an opportunity to increase their profits. The second wave of rationalisation, pointed out at the Wedding Party Congress, is expressed in further concentration of the means of production and of the banks. The interconnections between different companies and undertakings are growing greater and more numerous, are overstepping national frontiers and giving rise to extremely powerful groups of interests which bring the danger of new imperialist wars into the immediate future. One of the most important examples of this development in recent times is the amalgamation of the German Bank and the Diskonto Company with the Schaffhaus Banking Union and the Southern Diskonto Company into one of the most powerful banking institutions of the world.

The rate of work in the factories is being continually increased. Many small concerns are closing down and of course the workers are dismissed. In large concerns great numbers of workers are being dismissed as a result of the intensified methods of exploitation, which render them superfluous. The number of constantly unemployed workers is increasing by thousands. The coming winter in Germany will find from two to three million workers in the army of unemployed.

The attack of the monopolists in this second wave of rationalisation is directed not only against the existing wage level and is concerned not only with the direct intensification of exploitation—it is principally directed against

the present social advantages of the workers, modest though they are. The most important blow delivered to the workers in this respect is the change for the worse in the conditions of unemployment insurance, a change which was accomplished with the help of the social fascists. This has squeezed millions out of the poorest sections of the working-class population, besides everything that they have to pay in one form of taxation or another. The second objective behind this measure is to weaken the fighting front of the proletariat by increasing competition among the workers. This attack on social institutions is being continued. The *Rhine-Westphalian Times*, principal organ of the industrialists, made further demands in this sphere on October 8. For example, the State's contribution to sickness funds, which amounted to 32 millions, should be abolished; the State's contributions to sickness insurance should not, in future, be paid in cash, but by that very doubtful method of so-called "fund exchanges," which would amount to a swindle of about 165 millions annually. This is extremely reminiscent of the State's theft of sickness insurance funds during the war and in the period of inflation.

At the same time the cost of living is rising. Without much fuss being made about it, prices are raised and taxes on the most vital necessities increased. The *Reichstag* Committee on Commercial Policy decided on October 9, having strangled any discussion on the subject, to raise the duties immediately on live cattle from 13.00 to 24.50 marks per hundred kilos, on live sheep from 13.00 to 22.50 marks, and on fresh or frozen meat to 45.00 marks.

At the conference of German industrialists which took place in Dusseldorf on September 21, the brutal fascist policy of the German bourgeoisie towards the workers was made quite clear. Government Councillor Kastel, member of the Management Committee of the National Union of German Industry, declared quite unambiguously that it was up to Germany to create markets for its commodities in as many countries as possible and to the greatest extent possible. As for existing marketing possibilities, every effort must be made to increase Germany's share in world trade. Germany must employ the keenest competitive methods. Should new marketing spheres be opened in world economy

because of social changes or other developments, Germany must be the first competitor on the spot.

This conference was attended by representatives of the *Reichswehr* Ministry as well as of the various authorities. The delegation from the *Reichswehr* ministry consisted of a lieutenant-general, a colonel, three lieutenant-colonels, a vice-admiral and a frigate-captain. Several officers of the district military staff were also present, including a lieutenant-general from headquarters, a lieutenant-colonel, two majors, a captain of horse and a naval captain. This is evidence of the German bourgeoisie's warlike greed for expansion and of the fact that systematic and energetic preparations are being made for the seizure by violence of new spheres of influence and markets. The close relationships with the Entente Powers and the home policy of fascism against the revolutionary workers prove incontestably that these preparations for overcoming the difficulties of German capitalism are directed against the Soviet Union.

The growing acuteness of the situation and the growing resistance of the proletariat is expressed in the rapidity of the bourgeois State's development towards fascism. The aim of German trust capital is to create a broad and stable coalition extending from the agrarians to the social fascist bureaucracy and the trade unions, while its own predominance is preserved in its entirety. Consequently the bourgeoisie supports the fascist movement among the peasants, which is organised by the large landowners. That is why it supports the fascist organisations in the factories more energetically now than ever before and employs their members as thugs, spies and provocators against the workers. That is why it is urging the trade union bureaucrats, by methods of corruption and here and there by great pressure, to fight the militant workers more fiercely than ever. The social fascist civil servants, police presidents, police ministers, etc., are counted among the most useful and efficient tools for promoting the imperialist development of the German bourgeoisie.

Fascist development in Germany is proceeding through numerous apparent contradictions. The most varied measures and methods are employed to mislead and confuse the different sections of the population, each according to its social position, and to prevent the formation of a

united militant front of the workers. The fascist movement, led by the landowners, by former imperial officers, by social democrats who have openly gone over to fascism, uses, in its propaganda, anti-semitism, and particularly anti-capitalist phraseology, in order to befog the workers. It cunningly mixes its demagogic-radical propaganda with the worst sort of nationalism and strongly attacks the Young Plan. In conjunction with the German nationalists—the fascists are organising a so-called popular referendum on the acceptance or rejection of the Young Plan. The only object of this move is to create a special basis for fascist propaganda, to distract the workers' attention from the capitalist offensive and to weaken their fighting capacity. It is therefore our urgent duty to expose this shameful manœuvre and to appeal to the masses not to take part in it, but to carry on a relentless struggle, under the leadership of the Communist Party, against the capitalist offensive by the organisation of mass proletarian struggle, of fighting bodies whose determined and aggressive opposition to the fascist bodies will carry the workers forward towards the revolutionary solution of the difficulties which beset the workers under the capitalist exploitation system.

There is no doubt that very close relations exist between the German fascists and the Austrian *Heimwehr*, the Mussolini régime in Italy and the murderous fascist governments of Yugo-Slavia, Rumania, etc. The West European fascist block is in process of formation.

The social fascist development of the social democrats and trade union bureaucrats is proceeding rapidly, despite the various tricks of Severing, Grzesinski, Wissell, Leipart and Co.; calculated to conceal the true nature of what is happening. Zörgiebel's blood-bath on May 1st, the systematic activity of the trade unions in strike-breaking, the treacherous actions of social fascist factory councils against revolutionary workers, the close co-operation of the trade union bureaucrats and the employers, directed against the Communists, their co-operation with the police to fight the revolutionary movement, all this shows that the fascist and social fascist forces are only the two different sides of one and the same medal.

The policy of the social fascists is of course much more complicated and difficult. It is by

no means easy for them to exercise influence over the masses, to continue to mislead them and still to retain control over them, while they—the social fascists—employ such unscrupulous measures as Zörgiebel's murderous acts on May Day and the strike-breaking activity of the bureaucrats of the German Metal Workers' Union in the recent pipe-layers' fight. If they are to betray the masses any further, they will have to employ measures as "radical" as those recently employed by the social fascist bureaucrats. The social democratic "anti-war demonstration" in Berlin on August 1st; Grzesinski's ban on the *Stahlhelm* in Rhineland-Westphalia, the threat to ban other fascist bodies, the radical phrases used during social democracy's recruiting week and for the forthcoming local elections, serve no other purpose than to help forward the fascist referendum. At the same time that the social fascists carry out their radical manœuvres, they are demanding the abolition of the immunity of Communist deputies in regard to the May struggles, they encourage the police to attack the striking pipe-layers and building workers, they allow pickets to be arrested, finance strike-breaking bodies, suppress the Red Front Fighters' League and the recently established workers' defence corps, prohibit the anti-fascist congress, split the trade unions and create all the necessary preliminaries for the advance and establishment of fascism. The time is drawing near when the words spoken by President Schacht about a year and a half ago, referring to the limitation of foreign loans for the municipalities and the consequent increase in unemployment, will become true. At that time Schacht said: "Sooner or later blood will flow." We believe that the coming winter will witness an alignment of the class front sharp enough to give content to those words.

II.

The all-round intensification of class contradictions in Germany and the various facts connected therewith prove how urgent was the necessity to change the policy of the C.P. The German working-class would be entirely without leadership against the fascist offensive if the change in Party policy from revolutionary propaganda to the organisation of revolutionary action had not taken place at the right time. The social fascist leaders of the unions are

without exception, going over to the camp of the class enemy. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the German working-class is creating a new leadership for its daily struggle.

The activity of the workers is increasing from day to day. On all fronts and in all spheres preparations are being made for the coming great struggles between the classes. Step by step the German workers are freeing themselves from the obstructive, destructive and weakening influence of the social fascist trade union bureaucracy which, during the year 1929, has conducted scarcely a single fight for raising wages or shortening hours, but has together with the State arbitration bodies and the employers strangled working-class activity by concluding reactionary agreements and organising strike-breaking against the workers who fought under the leadership of the revolutionary opposition. Only in the case of lock-outs was the social fascist bureaucracy at the head of the movement, and then only in order to betray the workers' interests on behalf of "protecting the national economy" from disaster. Even the greatest leaders of social fascism, the Committee of the German Trade Union Federation, had to admit in the Annual Report for 1928 that, for the year 1929, the workers will have to count upon a reduction in real wages.

After a decade of such trade union activity, the German workers are now compelled to organise their struggle under the leadership of the revolutionary opposition, fighting against the bureaucrats of the trade unions machine, against the wrong traditions so carefully guarded by those traitors, against the united action of the bureaucrats, the State and the employers. Consequently, the organisation of the struggle to-day meets with far greater difficulties than in the pre-war period, when the German trade unions numbered only about 20 per cent. of their present membership and fought the workers' economic battles. At present the German workers, since their unions have turned fascist, even lack that organisational basis for their struggle which they possessed before the war. It is therefore a necessary development of conditions that, in the present phase of the employers' offensive, the counter-offensive of the workers should take the form of an increasing number of small, partial struggles either breaking out spontaneously or else

organised by the revolutionary opposition. In these small struggles the workers are training themselves to organise their movement on a broader basis, despite the sabotage of the trade union bureaucrats, which will only serve to accelerate the transition to a mass movement, growing as the struggle itself grows in intensity.

The numerous struggles which broke out in German factories, were conducted with great endurance and fortitude—with only little support and restrained, suppressed and weakened as they were by the activities of the bureaucrats, persecuted as they were by the police, the workers held out, in these various disputes, for from four to seventeen weeks. There have been several instances, and they are increasing in number, when the workers in a factory downed tools in order to protect a revolutionary factory committee from dismissal. In this respect the strikes at Cronenberg and at the Bamag works in Berlin were particularly significant. The pipe layers' strike is of the greatest importance for the further development of the revolutionary class struggle in Germany, as is also the Hennigsdorf strike, the various building workers' strike, the dispute at Bleichart's in Neuss, etc., etc. All these struggles were carried on despite the existence of reactionary agreements and were fought directly against the employers and the State. For the first time the fetters of agreement were broken. The rest of the working-class displayed increasing solidarity and these struggles showed up the strike-breaking activities of the trade union bureaucrats, deepened the militant experience of the masses and hastened the growth and development of new forms of conducting the revolutionary struggle.

Even in those cases where the dispute ended in a defeat for the workers, no decay or dissipation of the revolutionary forces was apparent. On the contrary, the workers were more than ever convinced of the necessity of being better organised and of carrying on the fight on a wider front.

The growth of economic struggles provides the basis for the development of greater political mass strikes. It is true that the number of workers who took part in the political mass strikes on May 1st, August 1st and September 30th was comparatively small. But it is also true that the number is growing and the movement spreading to many large factories. Revo-

lutionary strikes are in an upward phase of development. The political mass strike is being more and more recognised by the workers as the real militant method in the next stage of the class struggle. The work of the C.P.G. consists in attaining such a stage in the organisation of this fight as will ensure the effective development of the proletariat towards a conscious and energetic counter-attack on the employers along the widest possible front, and create better conditions for carrying on the forthcoming great revolutionary mass struggles.

Although our success in organising mass strikes has not been very great, the proletarian forces are concentrating more firmly every day. The movement against the theft of benefits requires the co-operation of employed and unemployed. For the first time since the establishment of a revolutionary unemployed movement the workers succeeded in convening conferences which were remarkably well attended by both employed and unemployed. The conferences of the opposition groups are also being attended by an increasing number of workers, including those not organised in a political party. These conferences were financed by the workers in the factories themselves, and by the bodies sending delegates. The desire for a revolutionary trade union press to fight the social fascist trade union press, which disposes of about six million copies weekly, is growing much stronger. The demand for a firmer amalgamation of revolutionary forces that the struggle may be better organised and the attack on the social fascist bureaucracy strengthened, is raised more and more urgently. The struggle against fascist attacks on Communist printing presses, on party, local and other revolutionary bodies, is increasing in activity. Many thousands of workers have joined up in the anti-fascist defence corps; while more thousands of workers are being imbued with the ideas of the revolutionary class struggle in the Sports and Freethinkers' organisations. When the social fascists organised a split in these bodies the great majority of the members remained with the revolutionaries. The gravity of the present situation and the acute menace of imperialist war has now been grasped and understood by large sections of the 'proletariat, despite the confusing and misleading activities of the social

fascists and the right wing liquidators such as Brandler and Thalheimer.

The growing difficulties of the German bourgeoisie and the magnificent impression made by the five-year plan has given rise to a certain hesitation and doubt in bourgeois intellectual circles which is not wholly without interest in obtaining a correct estimate of the movement of class forces. There are a growing number of bourgeois writers who emphasise the hopelessness of capitalist development and point out that in the long run collective economy will replace capitalism. This is not a sign that the bourgeois intellectuals will take up the fight against capitalism, but it is a very definite sign of capitalism's progressive decay. Such indications of collapse in bourgeois circles represent, however, a very real danger for the bourgeoisie in its present position, a danger which is increased by the continued interest of the workers in the results of socialist construction in the Soviet Union. In order to meet this danger and to bind the social fascist trade union bureaucracy still more firmly to themselves, the German industrialists, at their Dusseldorf conference, felt themselves obliged to emphasise strongly their conviction of the absolute necessity of maintaining the individual management of industry. They were also forced, at this conference, to oppose the doctrines of Karl Marx and to discredit construction in the Soviet Union when they declared that, so far, the example of Russia offered no proof of the correctness of Marxian theory and no justification of its economic or political doctrines and that on the contrary, Russia showed that humanity cannot attain happiness along those lines.

In connection with this, Duisberg, the leader of the German industrialists, expressed sharp opposition to the realisation of social democratic, so-called economic democracy, as it is understood by one section of the workers who, influenced by the demagogic propaganda of reformist leaders, look to the establishment of economic democracy to strengthen the position and rights of factory councils and to increase social benefits, etc.

Duisberg, however, did not attack that conception of economic democracy held by the leaders of the German Trade Union Federation, for whom democracy in industry means co-

operation of the trade unions and employers' organisations on the State Economic Council, the district economic councils, the trust supervisory committees, etc., for the purpose of promoting and assisting capitalist economy. Duisberg and Leipart are quite unanimous in their rejection of any democracy in the factories themselves.

The economic democracy preached by the social fascist bureaucrats is nothing but the theoretical basis for social fascism. The bureaucrats are trying to strengthen their hold on the workers by systematic efforts at concentration within the trade unions. In this work they favour those organisations which contain a strong element of the labour aristocracy or in which there is a large number of workers who, because of the privileges which they possess as against the rest of the working-class, are more difficult to draw into the proletarian class struggle. The amalgamation of the State and municipal employees' and transport workers' organisations was effected to serve this purpose. On the other hand the bureaucrats are carrying on a systematic campaign against the revolutionary opposition. They are trying to deprive the revolutionaries of their positions in the unions, dissolving local committees of a revolutionary character, excluding revolutionary workers from the unions and establishing a relentless dictatorship in the trade union bodies.

In such a situation, it is quite clear that the organisation of any proletarian struggle is necessarily directed against the social fascist bureaucrats. their dictatorial trade union statutes and rules, as well as against bourgeois laws and, consequently against the State. To-day, fear of breaking trade union rules or bourgeois laws in order to avoid exclusion from the union or difficulties with the State power, means an utter and complete surrender of the revolutionary class struggle. That is why every strike is of great importance. These struggles are no longer merely economic movements, they are revolutionary strikes and, as it were, outpost encounters heralding the greater struggles which will take place in the near future between the classes.

III

The present winter, and even more the coming spring, will witness a rapid growth of proletarian struggles in Germany. In the

winter months the millions of unemployed will make energetic attacks on the municipalities and the State to obtain the means whereby to keep themselves alive. The number of strikes and lock-outs will also grow; the whole movement will be led by the revolutionary opposition, which, together with C.P. can alone organise on a wide front the fight against fascist impoverishment and suppression.

The National Congress of the revolutionary trade union opposition will take place at the end of November. Its job will be to prepare for the coming struggles, to evaluate and generalise the experiences of the recent period of struggle, to discuss the election of factory councils and trade union officials, to organise in a firmer fashion the concentration of all revolutionary forces. The delegates to the congress are to be elected and financed by the factory workers, the workers at the labour exchanges and the revolutionary trade union bodies. The congress should result in an increase, a widening and deepening of the activity of the revolutionary opposition, in the mobilisation of the masses and the organisation of the struggle, as well as in a powerful extension of the fight against the social trade union bureaucracy. It is a fighting congress, and it must forge the weapons for the coming period of struggle. It is necessary to destroy any illusion that the social fascist bureaucracy will organise the fight for higher wages, for the seven-hour day, for unemployment relief, or against rationalisation. In 1929 these bureaucrats sabotaged every movement of working-class attack. The number of working days lost in strikes and lock-outs decreased from 10.2 million in the fourth quarter of 1928 to 1.1 million in the first quarter of 1929. For strikes the respective figures were 3.6 and 0.5 million, and for lock-outs 6.6 and 0.6 million. These figures only refer to disputes conducted by the trade union bureaucracy. They are far below the average quarterly figures for the period from 1899 to 1903, when the average number of working days lost per quarter amounted to 2.1 million. The figures for the first quarter of this year relate to a period of rapidly growing militancy on the part of the masses which could not be fully utilised because of the deficiencies in the organisational readiness of the revolutionary vanguard to start and to carry out struggles concerning wages and hours. However,

the number of "wild" strikes increased rapidly, in the second quarter although the number of strikers was still comparatively small.

With great astuteness, the trade union bureaucrats, working together with the arbitration committees and the employers, have fettered the workers in long-term agreements, whose expiration has been arranged in the interests of the bourgeoisie, for different periods of the year for the various industrial groups, an arrangement which will put great difficulties in the way of concentrating the forces of the workers.

The coming struggles will therefore necessarily take place in face of and against the existing agreements. Every struggle, as we have already pointed out, will be conducted not only against the employer, but also against the State and will develop into a revolutionary struggle as the general situation becomes critical.

Faced with this prospect, the Party must seriously deal with its work in the spirit of self-criticism; this is essential if its present weaknesses and defects are to be overcome and the experiences of the past fully utilised.

The most important defect in the work of the Party and the revolutionary opposition has been insufficient work in organising the political and economic struggles of the masses. The political strikes which occurred after 1st May, or 1st August, and in protest against the worsening of unemployment benefits on 30th September were not nearly strong enough, although both the number of those participating, and the importance of the working-class groups participating, showed an upward development. Of course there are tremendously great objective and subjective difficulties in the way of initiating such struggles in Germany. The huge social fascist machine of the trade unions, the co-operatives and other reformist bodies are a powerful obstacle, which does not exist in many other countries. If the required policy is to be carried out, there must be a complete and thorough-going change in the ideas of the Party membership and the working-class, who are very strongly influenced by trade union legalist ideas and can scarcely conceive of working-class struggles without the participation and leadership of the trade unions. The belief in an "overflowing strike fund" as the most important condition for carrying on struggles must be

utterly destroyed. We must establish new forms of mobilising the masses and conducting struggles in place of the old corrupt trade union leadership with its reformist methods. Important progress has already been made in this direction. The necessity of leading the struggles of electing a united fighting leadership, has been to a large extent fulfilled. The systematic organisation of revolutionary forces and the establishment of close contact between revolutionary factory councils and the workers in the factories by the election of revolutionary shop stewards have not, however, been so far advanced. The rate of carrying out the necessary changes in the Party and among the working masses and the creation of the necessary organisational basis for conducting struggle has, on the whole, been too slow and has not kept pace with the increasing objective intensification of the general situation.

In regard to this, the most important facts as far as the Party is concerned are the following:

The Party has not analysed with sufficient sharpness the present situation and has, in particular, under-estimated the growth and development of fascism.

Certain sections of the Party still mistrust the correctness and practicability of the Party's policy based on the independent organisation of mass action. Some Party leaders doubt the possibilities of success and fear defeat and consequently try to evade the organisation of the struggle.

Strong trade union legalist tendencies still exist. There is, as a result, a lack of understanding of the great importance of the new forms of organisation which will serve to strengthen the Party's influence among the masses, to mobilise them and to set the fight going.

The Party's work is not concentrated enough, particularly the work of local and district party, committees, on winning over the decisive sections of the working-class and on organising the fight.

The factory groups are not given enough support in their work. Nor does the Party devote sufficient attention to those struggles which, though they are of a local character, possess great political significance.

These defects give rise to vacillation of both a right and a left nature, concerning the Party's

policy. They prevent the Party and the revolutionary opposition from making the fullest use of the present possibilities of struggle. These defects must be fought relentlessly. Besides the necessary work of comprehensive enlightenment and training, the Party must draw up concrete tasks for every industrial group, for every factory and for every organisation, it must develop self-criticism within the Party and place the activities of Party bodies and of individual officials under the control of the masses. The working-class itself must openly judge the work of the Communist groups and the Communist leaders. In addition to this, the Party's methods of work must be improved—they must be rationalised. Party committees must be transformed into energetic executive bodies and their initiative increased. The forthcoming "national control" should create the conditions which are essential if the necessary changes are to be made, by the selection of competent leaders and by drawing in new and as yet unused forces into the Party leadership.

All these questions are inseparably connected with the great problem of drawing new sections of workers into active revolutionary work and of establishing enduring and stable fighting bodies to carry on the daily struggle within the different industrial groups, in the districts, and on a national scale.

The Party organisations do not suffice to lead the daily fight and the economic strikes of the workers; to organise and develop political mass struggle on a broader basis; this requires that the large numbers of active, revolutionary workers who form, as it were, the periphery of the Party and from whom the Party wins its recruits, should be drawn in to constant co-operation with the Party in this work. This requires further, that many capable Communist and non-party workers should develop into recognised leaders of the masses, men in whom the workers have confidence, to whose slogans the workers will listen in their preparation for and carrying on of fights.

The Party must also face the problem of establishing a firmer amalgamation of revolu-

tionary forces, of preparing and influencing the increasing ranks of the revolutionary workers and thereby extending the ranks of revolutionary fighters.

The revolutionary shop stewards in the factories and their supporters, the revolutionary stewards among the unemployed and their supporters, are the basic groups from which a strong leadership to organise and conduct the fight in the various industries and districts must be formed.

This will draw new revolutionary workers into the Communist factory groups and trade union fractions, and will enable the Party to penetrate into those factories and unions where at present no revolutionary groups exist and where the Party has no organisation.

This will make it possible to take the initiative in our work, to connect the whole movement for organising the struggle in the factories and among the unemployed with the struggle against the social fascist trade union bureaucracy. This will make it possible to extend revolutionary propaganda, to create a basis for a revolutionary trade union press and for distributing Communist factory papers and to prevent the workers who are approaching the Party from being turned aside from their path towards the revolutionary movement by the "left" social democrats, by the Brandlerites or other renegades.

The work of organising and leading economic struggles by uniting organised and unorganised workers, must at the present time be carried on from the standpoint of transforming them into broad political struggles. Successful work in this sphere is essential if the Party is to establish firmly a strong political influence over the masses by using these forms of organisation, if it is to fulfil its obligations towards the working-class. The time has come for the Party to take an energetic step forward in this direction, despite all the expulsions and splittings of the social fascist bureaucracy.

